

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/713,867	Applicant(s) HUDSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Christopher S. McCarthy	Art Unit 2113	

All Participants:

 (1) Christopher S. McCarthy.

 (2) Genie Lyons, Reg.#43,841.
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 December 2006
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

21-30

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner requested a change in the preamble of claim 21 to recite a storage medium so as to not include a communication medium and therefore be deemed non-statutory; the representative complied. The examiner also requested that the dependent claims be amended to include the computer storage medium language as to further limit the medium language and not the method; the representative complied. The examiner and representative also discussed the claim language of claim 30. Upon questioning by the examiner, the representative explained that the means for language is defined in the specification and drawings to be enabled to be utilized on hardware, and not be just mere program modules, which would deem it non-statutory. In light of the discussion, the examiner concluded that the means could hardware on a computing device, as described, and therefore is statutory.